

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

Jennifer Maudlin,

Plaintiff,

v.

Inside Out, Inc. and William Stout,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-00354

Chief Magistrate Judge Sharon L. Ovington

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO ESTABLISH EXPEDITED BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON
HER MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY**

Plaintiff, by and through her counsel, respectfully moves this Court to enter an order providing for expedited briefing of her Motion to Compel Discovery, which motion is also filed today.

In support of this motion, Plaintiff states as follows:

1. Plaintiff served her First Set of Interrogatories and First Set of Document Requests upon Defendants on September 3, 2014. Responses were due on October 3, 2013.
2. On Oct 2, 2014 Defendants moved, with the agreement of the parties, for an extension of time until October 27, 2014. (Doc. 22). Defendants then switched counsel and requested an additional extension of time, so the time was again extended, this time to November 14.

3. Defendants served their Objections and Answers to Plaintiff's Discovery Requests on November 14, 2014, about 6 weeks after the original due date. Many objections were interposed, most of which are now the subject of Plaintiff's accompanying Motion to Compel.
4. From November 25, through January 6, the parties engaged in consultation and several rounds of back-and-forth letters and emails which, although they did not resolve many of the objections, did crystalize the discovery disputes.
5. Discovery in this case is scheduled to close on February 27, 2015, just a little more than six weeks from now. (Doc. 26, Amended Scheduling Order)
6. If Plaintiff's Motion to Compel were to proceed according to an ordinary briefing schedule, Defendants' Response would not be due until February 5, which is just 22 days before the close of discovery; a Reply may be necessary; and the Court will require some amount of time to resolve the Motion. Therefore, the resolution of these discovery disputes may not come until very near the close of discovery. This would not allow time to follow up on any of the information produced. (Approximately 10 depositions are being noticed or subpoenaed, the first of which will be the deposition of defendant William Stout on February 3.) If it is necessary to question any witness(es) about material produced as a result of the Motion to Compel, to reconvene a deposition would not only be impractical given the date, but also an imposition on the witness.

For the above reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court establish an expedited briefing schedule on her Motion to Compel. Plaintiff suggests that Defendants file their response in 8 days, on January 23, and that Plaintiff file her reply, if any, 4 days after that, on January 27.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Freda J. Levenson

Freda J. Levenson (0045916)
ACLU of Ohio
4506 Chester Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44103
216-472-2220
flevenson@acluohio.org
Trial Attorney for Plaintiff

Lenora M. Lapidus*
llapidus@aclu.org
Galen Sherwin*
gsherwin@aclu.org
Brian Hauss
bhauss@aclu.org
(Pro Hac Vice Motion to be filed)
American Civil Liberties Union – Women’s
Rights Project
125 Broad St., 18th Fl.
New York, NY 10004
(212) 519-7848

*Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The foregoing motion was filed on the 15th day of January, 2015 through the Court’s Electronic Filing System and parties will be served and may obtain copies electronically through the operation of the Electronic Filing System.

/s/ Freda J. Levenson

Freda J. Levenson (0045916)

Trial Attorney for Plaintiff